



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the martial life. But beyond this the pacifist insists that the iniquity of war is so comprehensive that its redemption by qualities of merit within the organization or by its past service in welding unity of national endeavor is hopeless. It is idle to consider that we can favor in any measure the perpetuation of war as an institution for the sake of the heroic qualities or even the national communion that it admittedly strengthens. The point is not, as a pacifist argues, that we should refuse to consider setting houses on fire for the sake of giving heroic firemen a chance to show their heroism—for that is a false analogy—but that, admitting the inherent and not incidental nature of the moral redemption associated with war, it cannot offset, even within the moral field, its equally inherent losses and its common degradations.

In the conduct of argument the pacifist has faced a difficult task. He has had to prepare the minds of men for a mode of looking at the evolution of the past and the constitution of the present order that runs counter to the usual habit. War as a possibility has been woven into the fabric of national coherence; its elimination threatened to leave not a gap, but a weakening of all the strands. The arguments confronting the pacifist are naturally the converse of those that he goes boldly to find in the enemy camp and seeks to put to rout; but, when thus converted, they present a somewhat different front. The moral argument appears as the corruption inherent in an enduring peace freed from the stiffening discipline of war. "The certainty of peace"—not the actual state of peace—"would, before the expiration of half a century, engender a state of corruption and decadence more destructive of men than the worst wars." It appears also in the inability of the peace routine to summon the highest virtues upon a large scale. "In peace man belongs to himself. He knows no other law than his personal interest. He no longer has any other occupation than to seek his own good. The greatest virtue is self-abnegation, the spirit of self-sacrifice, and it is in armies during war that that virtue is practiced. It is not only the individual whom war ennoble, but also the entire nation." "War regenerates corrupted peoples; it awakens dormant nations; it rouses self-forgetful, self-abandoned races from their mortal languor. In all times war has been an essential factor in civilization. It has exercised a happy influence upon customs, arts, and sciences." "Unless . . . war is the divinely appointed means by which the environment may be adjusted until ethically 'fittest' and 'best' become synonymous, the outlook for the human race is too pitiable for words." "Yet unless human nature shall have been radically modified in the course of evolution—unless it shall have attained a moral strength and stature unknown at present—it appears certain that the attainment of this much-desired universal peace will be as the signal for the beginning of universal decay."\* . . .

\* The first two citations are from German, the last two from English writers. In specific arguments the militarists of the two countries are often in close accord. But the setting of such citations in the German writers, even in the more responsible ones, show a more uncompromising position than obtains among the English. Arguments of moral and national benefit are more incidental to the German presentation, in which the "might is right" doctrine dominates, while they are frequently central in English considerations.

Argument can do little more to produce conviction; the spreading of the campaign as a proselyting force must do the rest. If the impression already made is limited in proportion to its inherent strength, the cause must be found in the logic of long-established institutions, vested interests, and the mental inertia which they cherish, not in a spirit of worship of tradition, but of a conservative prudence. As the abolitionists or the "equal suffragists" had a long career of unpopularity and an uphill campaign against thick prejudice to overcome before their cause became serious, respected, and at length dominant, and as, long before a decision was reached by conflict of arms or opinions or ballots, the causes were first and firmly established in the minds of men, and only later in their practical policies and decisions, so must pacifism pass through the same evolution. Events may hasten or they may retard the issue. The essential step in their hastening that argument can perform to strengthen the psychology of conviction is to face the logic of reality, and by plausible construction induce reflective minds to enter upon the venture.

## REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE AT THE PEACE SETTLEMENT

By LUCIA AMES MEAD

**T**WENTY-FIVE belligerent nations are presently to make the most momentous decisions in human history. They may create conditions that will breed rivalry, further world war, and the decay of civilization, or they may institute a new order of justice, freedom, and co-operation. Only a few persons, at the most—perhaps not more than 250—will sit at the final conference and sign the treaties or compacts that will determine the fate of nations. Who those persons will be and what they will represent deeply concern all who have at heart the future of democracy.

Even the popularly elected branches of the governments of the world cannot be trusted at the present moment to represent their people's will. The House of Commons has been in session seven years, and twice has had its limit somewhat extended. It must add its eight million new voters and have a general election before it can be said to represent the British people. Even then, unless new elements and new methods are introduced, it will indicate only vaguely what persons the people desire to have represent them at a conference which ought to initiate a new world-order. The men to be chosen to conduct a war to success would not all necessarily be those best fitted to work out new plans at a peace settlement. In the United States, the present House of Representatives, elected before the war was entered on or expected, does not represent the people adequately. It represents localities rather than vital interests, and has not more than one representative of labor interests and few who were elected for great, progressive measures of reform in international affairs.

The lower houses of other countries cannot be said at present adequately to represent the thought and feeling of the great masses of the people who are bearing the intolerable burden of conditions brought about by governments supposedly representing them. If some new

method is not thought out and generally accepted, by which the demands of the people shall be heard at the peace settlement, and if this method is not applied speedily, a possible ending of the war within a year would leave the people practically voiceless, as it is certain that no full and genuine expression could be made through the press. The latter in all countries has been curbed by governmental orders, financial interests, and timidity, and will remain so curbed until the end. Only through agencies outside the press and the governments can the common people find expression of their main purposes and interests as regards the new era in human history on which we are now entering.

Some of those who are most ardent for a popular expression of opinion believe that there should be a direct vote of all the 18,000,000 and more voters in the land. They ignore, it would seem, the enormous difficulty, first, in getting nominations which would represent interests and not localities, and, second, in persuading a Congress, skeptical of their main purpose, to make the necessary appropriations and to provide the necessary machinery for such an unprecedented proceeding. When one comes to study the matter and to visualize the details and tremendous delay incident to a general vote, it is difficult to understand how it can be urged by thoughtful people. Apparently they have in mind two houses sitting at the peace settlement, one composed of experts and appointees of the governments; the other, one that should endorse or veto the proceedings of the government appointees. Such a body as the latter may some time be called into being if, as we hope, we are to have a league of nations which shall create a parliament of the world. In that case, there might be a senate representing nations, and a lower house, representing peoples according to populations and popularly chosen according to the method discussed above. But such a scheme seems premature at present and not best adapted to the peace settlement.

The problems which will be presented at the peace settlement conference are incalculably greater and more intricate than any which ever confronted a similar conference. Every member of the conference ought to be an extraordinarily able person, acquainted not merely with the interests of the people, but with the intricacies of the problem of creating harmony in an interdependent world. He ought to be present and to hear all the testimony and argument that both the Allies and the Central Powers present. He ought for months or years to have studied carefully the documentary evidence which in each country has been prepared as to the causes and events in question and to be familiar with the claims that will be presented by the opposing side. As soon as possible, the people's representatives should apply themselves to completing their studies, which it will be presumed that they have already been carrying on for years upon the world problems that are involved in the great settlement.

The following methods are suggested as worthy of consideration by all who have at heart the accomplishment of a democratic peace, in which mere precedent and privilege shall no longer be permitted to determine the fate of suffering humanity:

1. Let the President be asked to present the following plan (if it meet with his approval, after being en-

dorsed by various experts and organizations) to the House of Representatives, with the recommendation that it be carried out. If this plan is adopted by the House, that he then present the plan to the allied nations, and suggest that they also adopt this method, and that all combined use what influence they may to secure similar methods being adopted later by the other belligerents.

2. The lower house in each country shall be asked to appoint a committee of convenient size to act efficiently (the number fifteen is suggested), which shall represent various interests, political parties, and localities represented in the house. This committee shall draw up a list of all the important national organizations in the country which do not have ancestry as a basis of membership, which do not exist for mutual benefit or insurance, and which do not exist to promote art, athletics, or amusement. These organizations shall stand for ideas, principles, and the material, intellectual, and spiritual interests of the varied elements in the community. The committee shall divide these organizations into three groups, not necessarily of equal numbers of organizations. The three groups shall represent:

a. Labor and the interests of the artisan, farmer, and miner. These organizations in this country would include the National Granges, The American Federation of Labor, The National Non-Partisan League, etc., etc.

b. The business interests of the country and the more gainful professions. These organizations would include the national organizations of chambers of commerce, the American Bar Association, and national organizations that represent the railroad, banking, shipping, and mining interests.

c. The educational, religious, and reform interests of the country. These organizations would include the Federal Council of Churches, the National Education Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, etc., etc.

3. The committee of the lower House would select one of the largest of the organizations in each group, and request the executive board of this organization to announce a time and place of meeting for delegates from the executive boards of all the organizations in its group. This might or might not coincide with the time or place of meeting of the other two groups. The executive boards could be represented at their own option by their president or secretary or some other authorized person. On assembling, each group would proceed to elect its own chairman and to draw up its own rules of procedure. Then each group would nominate six persons of recognized ability and experience, whether or not members of organizations belonging to their own group, and would ascertain before dispersing whether they would accept or not appointment as delegates to the peace conference. Each group would draw up a body of doctrine as a guide to their respective delegates, and, if it chose, would make acceptance of this mandatory upon those who accept nomination.

4. The names of the eighteen nominees, with alternates, in case of later withdrawal of any nominee for whatever cause, would then be transmitted to the committee of the lower House, and likewise to the public.

5. The committee would then arrange for a preferential vote of the lower House for a certain number of

names from those submitted, an equal number being chosen from each group. The sum total from the three groups should at least equal the number of voting delegates sent by the government. As that number is not yet decided on, the number of the people's delegates would for some time remain uncertain. But the first choice from each group, and as many of the others as possible, should, directly after nomination, proceed to intensive study of the intricate and technical matters that must be understood in order not to defeat the very purposes that they have in view. The tactics of the present enemy at the peace settlement will be quite as shrewd as they have been during the war. The people's delegates must understand in advance all that the Central Powers are likely to present as regards the historic and other claims that must be considered in all territorial adjustments. They should at once be given special opportunities for information, and in all matters of detail be given a free hand. Only in broad, general outline should the body of doctrine above referred to prescribe their action.

With reasonable speed, in two months after the recommendation of this plan was acted upon by the lower House the nomination and election should be complete. Is there any better way in which to secure the co-operation of the governments and the silent masses and the representation of those interests which no partisan political bodies ever represent? Nothing would preclude unlimited suggestions and advice being offered to the nominating boards which meet in three groups. Every one who had anything to offer could send a telegram or letter. The will of the people could be much more clearly expressed than by ordinary political convention for nomination and a vote based on congressional districts.

The above is respectfully suggested as a feasible and not costly plan. If there is another which presents more advantages, will its advocate please present it?

## INTERNATIONAL NOTES

**A**RNOLD BENNETT in England and M. Gauvin in France have both protested lately against the habit of the Allied press of scorning or sneering at German peace proposals without any just consideration of them. Mr. Bennett fears mostly that this habit will result in a possible and trustworthy proposal creeping into the news some day only to be disregarded. M. Gauvin's objection would seem more securely founded, in that he condemns a practice which only aids Germany in convincing her people that the Allies will not listen to reason. Moreover, M. Gauvin criticizes the Allies for not stating boldly and unmistakably, without any ambiguous rhetorical flourishes, the plain fundamental bases of the peace they will accept. He points out that Germany is a specialist in omitting fundamentals and confining herself to detailed particulars. The Allies have here a tremendous advantage, since their conscience is clear and they can state, if they will, their past, present and future intentions in language that even the Kultur-bred Teuton can comprehend.

... "Tante Voss," or *Vossische Zeitung*, the beldame of the Berlin press, came out recently with its own version of Germany's peace terms. It conceded the full and free restoration of Belgian national independence. It allowed some modification of French and Italian boundaries, provided France, Italy, Germany and Austria were permitted to come to their own terms in this matter, with no outside intervention. It demanded (1) the return of all German colonies, (2) the restoration and return of all overseas rights and property of German merchants, (3) the unconditional evacuation by Great Britain of all parts of Turkey and Persia, (4) the *status quo ante bellum* in Egypt. An additional provision related to the free passage of the Dardanelles for Russian shipping.

... It is a matter of interest that a recent report on industrial settlements in England involves in its recommendations practically every principle involved in the program of the American Peace Society, and that it unmistakably repudiates enforced arbitration as unsuccessful in avoiding conflicts in wartime and less likely to do so in time of peace. The document is the supplementary report of the Whitley Committee on the Relations between Employers and Employed, published under the direction of the Minister of Reconstruction, Dr. Addison. The pronouncement against compulsory arbitration is extended to include schemes of conciliation providing for a suspension by force of a strike or lock-out pending an inquiry. Maintenance of the present machinery for voluntary conciliation and arbitration is strongly urged, with the view of the setting up of Joint Industrial Councils and the proposal to maintain permanent arbitration councils on the lines of the present temporary Committee on Production. To this latter council disputants would voluntarily submit their claims for decision where decision between themselves proved impossible. It is further proposed that the standing arbitration council should take means to secure the co-ordination of arbitrators' decisions. The committee are opposed to the enforcement of awards and agreements by means of monetary penalties.

... The principle of the freedom of subject nationalities to choose their own government is being applied at home by the Allies, as well as advocated abroad. India is the latest to benefit in this manner, or to be on the road to it, through the plan of limited home rule achieved by the Secretary for India, Mr. Edwin S. Montagu, and Baron Chelmsford, Viceroy and Governor General of India. This plan does not make the mistake of bestowing absolute unrestraint upon the as yet too unsophisticated possessors of a tremendously rich country. The aim is to give India as much freedom as, so to speak, it can absorb, with the ultimate aim of responsible self-government. The present proposal, which goes before the British Parliament for authentication, provides for (1) provincial legislatures, to be composed of directly elected representatives; (2) a vice-regal legislature for all India, to be composed of two chambers—the legislative assembly and the council of state; (3) an Indian privy council of which the members are to be appointed by the King, and (4) a council of